

ACCREDITATION STUDY WORK GROUP
June 16-17, 2004

WHAT IS THE THING THAT YOU WOULD <u>MOST</u> WANT THIS REVIEW TO ADDRESS	WHAT IS THE ONE THING THAT YOU WANT TO <u>MAINTAIN</u>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Better templates for Self Study • Better templates for document to COA • How we use quantifiable data, what data, role of data, intelligent use of data, use of qualitative with quantitative data • Models of best practices • National accreditation • Relationship with NCATE • Accreditation in other professions • Stipulations, revisits, sanctions (what is bad enough, are sanctions used effectively) • Accreditation as a framework for program improvement. How does it contribute to our understanding of effectiveness in programs? How does it inform practice? • What is accreditation and what is its purpose • Impact of candidate assessment to inform accreditation • More teachers represented in process, participation and inclusion of K-12, articulation between K-12/higher ed. • Unit accreditation versus program approval • Historical perspective versus snapshot approach (use of past accreditation findings, follow up reports) • Ensuring balance, bring process current • Adequate funding of accreditation • Link to Student Achievement, can it be done? • Self study reports – can they be done differently? • Training and education of reviewers • Public Perception about accreditation • Focus on outcomes and effectiveness • More diverse visit teams • Shift from “factors to consider” to “required elements” • Time lag between visits • Have changes in recent years been positive? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Peer Review (noted by many) • Site visit (noted by many) • Self Study • Concept of mixed teams • Inclusion of qualitative data • Professional nature of review • Professional decision-making • Sanctions